

12300
7424
ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

Dr. HAWEIS'

IMPARTIAL AND SUCCINCT

HISTORY

OF THE

CHURCH OF CHRIST,

BY THE REV. ISAAC MILNER, D. D.
DEAN OF CARLISLE, AND PRESIDENT OF QUEEN'S COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

BEING THE

PREFACE

TO THE SECOND EDITION OF VOL. I.

OF THE LATE REV. JOSEPH MILNER'S

HISTORY

OF THE

CHURCH OF CHRIST.

CAMBRIDGE,

PRINTED BY JOHN BURGESS PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY;
AND SOLD BY J. MATTHEWS, IN THE STRAND, AND
J. MAWMAN, LONDON; J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE;
J. COOKE, OXFORD; W. TESSEYMAN AND J. TODD,
YORK; T. BROWNE, HULL; J. BINNS, LEEDS;
J. COTTLE, BRISTOL; AND S. HAZARD, BATH.

MDCCC.

ANIMADVERSIONS

ON

Dr. HAWKES.

IMPARTIAL AND SUCCINCT

HISTORY

OF THE

CHURCH OF CHRIST.

By THE REV. ISAAC MILLNER, D.D.

DEAN OF CAMBRIDGE COLLEGE. ERRATA.

Page 6. line 17, read hypocrisy.

12. bottom, r. mentioned.

— in the note, for Page 327, r. Pages 225, 226,
and 227. Vol. ii. Mr. M.

27. in the note, r. Dr. H. Vol. i. p. 359.



TO THE SECOND EDITION OF VOL. I.

OF THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF CHRIST.

HAWKES.

OF THE

CHURCH OF CHRIST.



CAMBRIDGE.

PRINTED BY JOHN BURGESS PRINTER TO THE UNIVERSITY;
AND SOLD BY J. MATTHEWS, IN THE STRAND, AND
J. MAWMAN, LONDON; J. DIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE;
J. COOKE, OXFORD; W. TESSINGTON AND J. TODD,
YORK; T. BROWN, WHOLE; J. BIRNS, LEEDS;
J. COTTILL, BRISTOL; AND G. HAZARD, BATH.

MDCCC.

ANIMADVERSIONS, &c.

§ 1. **T**HE Editor of this second Edition of the first volume of the History of the Church of Christ by the late Rev. Joseph Milner, M. A. feels it his duty to inform the public, that, since the publication of the third volume of this work, two reasons have concurred to retard considerably the progress of a fourth Volume.—1st. The copies of the first volume became so very scarce and were called for so often, that the booksellers pressed exceedingly for an immediate re-publication of it.—With their wishes the Editor thought it proper to comply; and by so doing, the little leisure, which he could spare from indispensable duties, has been almost entirely employed in revising and correcting this first volume. 2dly. The decease of the Author, the worthy and beloved brother of the Editor,—has rendered it extremely difficult to prepare and fit for the Press such of the manuscripts as were intended to make a fourth volume.—While the Author was alive, many doubts and obscurities might be cleared up in a few minutes, which now cost the Editor hours and days; and, sometimes, he is at last compelled to desist from further investigation, without success,

cess, from want of knowing the meaning of some character of shorthand, or the proper edition to be made use of in consulting the authorities.

If it shall please Almighty God to favour him with a tolerable share of health, he still hopes to surmount most of the difficulties, — though not quite so soon as he could wish. — If the fourth volume, whenever it shall appear, should be thought less perfect than the rest, the candid reader, it is hoped, will recollect the main reason; — which, — to the Author's relatives and intimates, is truly a melancholy one.

§ 2. The Editor is well persuaded that the utility and propriety of continuing the History upon the same plan with the three volumes already published, and with the fourth now in the press, is, by no means, superceded by a late publication of the Rev. Dr. HAWKES, which he calls an impartial and succinct History of the Church of Christ. — Dr. H. indeed, represents himself and Mr. Milner as cordially united in the main point: He very often commends Mr. M. in strong language; — and, in one place he says, “I had hoped from him friendly rebuke where I may have erred, or, candid acquiescence in the force of truth where it appeared.” — But, if it be allowed, that the spirit of authors, and the objects they have in view, are to be collected, not so much from professions in prefaces or introductions, as from the works themselves; no discerning reader can possibly be disposed to infer much resemblance between these two writers of Ecclesiastical history. — Who can peruse Mr. M.'s volumes without being convinced, that the great object of the author is to exhibit, in every age, the character of the real followers of Jesus Christ, and the nature of genuine Christianity, considered as a practical thing? For this purpose,

purpose, his labours abound with luminous details and expositions from original documents. The historian has generally an opinion of his own, and a pretty strong one too, nor is he backward in discovering it; but, he is ever anxious to put his reader in possession of the evidence on which it is founded; to lay before him all, which, he thinks, is authentic, and connected with the subject;—and so, to give him a fair opportunity of judging for himself. He submits to him a chain of reasoning and observation; but it is accompanied with a regular body of collective historical proofs; which, when the Author's plan* is considered, distinguishes this publication from every other which has yet appeared.

§ 3. On the contrary, the hasty performance of Dr. H. is characterized throughout, by paucity of facts, by deficiency of evidence, and by positive and declamatory assertions.—The readers, who love to see ecclesiastical ranks, dignities and establishments degraded and vilified with indiscriminating aversion, will here meet with plenty of gratification for the four parts of their tempers, and for inveterate prejudices; though even of these readers—such as are the more experienced and

* For an account of the author's plan see the Introduction by himself. — Vol. 1.

“It is certain,” says he, “that from our Saviour's time to the present, there have ever been persons, whose dispositions and lives have been formed by the rules of the New Testament: men, who have been REAL, not merely NOMINAL Christians; who believed the doctrines of the Gospel, loved them because of their divine excellency, and suffered gladly THE LOSS OF ALL THINGS, THAT THEY MIGHT WIN CHRIST, AND BE FOUND IN HIM*.”—INTRODUCTION.

* Philip. iii. 8, 9.

and judicious in the arts of lowering and disparaging, will be apt to think that their author has overshot his mark by an excess of anxiety to produce the effect he has in view.—Pride, ambition, and immoralities of every kind, are, no doubt, peculiarly odious in dignified ecclesiastics, yet it should be remembered that, in endeavouring to excite our dislike and abhorrence of these vices, the mind may be fatigued and even rendered callous by being battered with incessant repetitions; and particularly, when the harsh language derives its support from manifest perversions and exaggerations of history.—Nor should it be forgotten, that even in stating simple events, the MANNER of doing it may discover very different feelings and tempers.—One does not expect that a narrative of the frauds, follies, hypocrisy, and ambitious excesses of ecclesiastical dignitaries, by a Clergyman of the Church of England, should, in any degree, resemble the profane and malevolent representations of the most insulting and reprobate infidels: Many persons will rather look for the wounded spirit of a humble Christian and of a faithful historian sorrowfully recording the truth.

§ 4. As Mr. M. is constantly in quest of the true followers of Jesus Christ; he is on all occasions delighted to find them; whether they be in caves, or monasteries,—in papal or in any other communion,—in great cities, or in the vallies of Piedmont,—in established churches, or in dissenting congregations. With him the character is decided, whenever it appears that the conduct is practically influenced by the essentials of Christianity; and, hence, he is often induced to make candid and large allowances for trying circumstances and seasons of darkness, corruption, and prejudice.

prejudice.—The Reader is to decide whether he allows too much; but whatever be his decision, he will own that his author is remarkably conscientious in furnishing him with materials to direct his opinion.

The Editor knows that serious persons of moderation and judgment, of all persuasions,—IN the establishment and OUT of it,—subscribe to this statement;—but it is not to be expected, that those, who approve of Dr. H.'s methods of estimating Christian worth and excellence should agree in the same determination. This writer is seldom warm or energetic, but when he is exhibiting charges of prelatical usurpation or encroachment: and one cannot but lament, that not only no candid ingenuity of discrimination is displayed in separating real from imaginary charges, but even common historical and argumentative justice is continually violated by this peremptory judge. Before his tribunal a bishop or dignitary of any kind has little chance of acquittal: Even the veracity of the venerable Cyprian is suspected, though he speak most explicitly and positively to particular facts. In ecclesiastical matters the exercise of any sort of authority, not immediately derived from the multitude, seems to be among the greatest crimes a man can commit, whether he be an emperor or a prelate. The commission of this crime instantly converts virtues into vices: The mildest government becomes oppression or tyranny; and the most exemplary piety is accused of fraud, hypocrisy and bigotry. The most respectable ancient historians, when they contradict these views, are dismissed not only without ceremony, but with unspeakable contempt; and the most valuable compositions in divinity, because not dressed in a modern

modern garb, or because tinged with some weaknesses of the times, are treated with a merciless and indecent criticism, which often betrays want of information in the highest degree.—Astonishment* is frequently expressed that others should be of a contrary sentiment: but, generally, and almost universally, little or no reason is given for the opinion.—Instances we have without number of pert and summary decision;—none of instructive and satisfactory discussion.

The rules, by which Dr. H. appears to judge of evidences and of characters, seem to be all reversed when

* Dr. H. is wonderfully apt to be astonished, and sometimes shocked, when he speaks of those who presume to differ from his sentiments, not only on Church Government, but even on the doctrines of Christianity.

Mr. Milner, in Vol. ii. p. 506, of his Church History, says, "The notion of particular redemption was unknown to the ancients; and I wish it had remained equally unknown to the moderns."

Dr. Haweis on this occasion, in Vol. ii. p. 18, of his Impartial history, expresses himself "shocked that the Scriptures of truth should be treated thus slightly; or the greatest and best of men be laid under so unbecoming a censure."—But he does not inform his reader that Mr. M. in the very page quoted by Dr. H. refers to the Scriptures of truth in proof of his position. 1 Tim. ii.

In which Chapter are these words:

— "Of God our Saviour, who will have ALL men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth. For there is one God, and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, Who gave himself a ransom for ALL."

One would think that any plain man might be allowed to infer from this "Scripture of truth," that Christ died for ALL without shocking the nicest feelings.

So very different a spirit pervades the histories of Dr. H. and of Mr. M. that the Editor is much inclined to believe that the Authors did not agree so nearly in their practical principles as Dr. H. seems to think.—In one place he says, "I am sorry to differ from a man I revere, and with whom I am generally one in sentiment and heart," p. 351. Vol. i.—And in several places he uses expressions of similar import.

when democratical and turbulent schismatics are to be defended: nor does it follow that he is, therefore, to be instantly accused of inconsistency or contradiction.—It should be recollected, that if Christian excellencies be sullied and debased by an esteem for ecclesiastical order, authority, and establishment, they will, probably, be embellished and exalted by the opposite disposition. The same spirit, which renders a man excessively and even absurdly jealous of admitting evidence in favour of an accused dignitary, is likely enough to produce extreme candour and abundant credulity in support of factious sectarians.—The judge has not changed his sentiments: he has different characters before him: In one case, he is inclined to doubt,—to suspect,—and to trample on authentic records, because he knows beforehand the man is guilty of the unpardonable sin of supporting Church Government: In the other, he feels himself authorized to hope,—conjecture,—go any lengths, against probabilities, in mitigation of vice; for the man has a virtue that compensates all defects;—he owns no authority but what is derived from the congregations; and these may split and separate into endless factions, and each of them elect its own RESPECTABLE bishop.

According to this plan a man has only, first to obtain the consent of a few discontented members of a congregation, and then to procure ordination by some weak, irregular, or immoral bishop, who perhaps arrived at the Episcopal dignity in a similar way; and he becomes at once a bishop truly chosen and ordained.

§ 5. With such a writer there can be no place for argumentative controversy: Arguments are misplaced, either where the mind is not in the habit of reasoning, or where there is a want of agreement on fundamental principles.

On

On which accounts the Editor of the second edition of this first volume of Mr. M.'s history was disposed to have taken no notice whatever of Dr. H.'s publication; fully persuaded, that such a book is not calculated to produce rational conviction; and also, that those, who have already embraced the wild theories and sentiments of the author, will not listen to dispassionate argumentation. He was disposed to have entirely omitted these cautionary observations, if his friends had not admonished him, that, notwithstanding Dr. H.'s composition is rendered less effective and less dangerous in its operation by the presence of the many obvious and offensive ingredients which suggested these remarks, yet it does not, in all cases, carry along with it its own antidote; and, that there is still a way left in which it may do essential mischief.

On this head he proceeds to explain himself as briefly as possible.

He understands, that he is called upon by the lovers of honesty and good faith in literary concerns to warn the minds of ingenuous searchers after truth, not to give implicit credit to the accuracy of Dr. H.'s quotations.—It is not his way to refer the reader much to chapters and pages of authentic documents; he has, however, frequently quoted the writings of the late Mr. M.

—Mr. M. was a firm believer in the propriety and the utility of ecclesiastical establishments; and he has been thought, in the opinion of respectable judges, to have shewn himself an able defender of his belief.—This subject is a tender point with Dr. H. and he will not deny, that he has it much at heart to overturn whatever opposes itself to his views of the truth in this matter.—In his zeal to surmount obstacles, and to arrive at his beloved conclusions, he has, in his quotations
from

from Mr. M., MOST GROSSLY misrepresented the meaning of that author.

The polite customs of the times will not permit the writer of this Preface to use the words which are precisely suited to the circumstances of this case;—he must, therefore, content himself with submitting to the candid and liberal feelings of every intelligent reader, who will take the trouble to compare a few examples of the quotations in question with their originals, whether they are not among the most unwarrantable and daring instances of misrepresentation that ever existed.

§ 6. In page 352. Vol. i. Dr. H. has these words.—What he takes for granted in the first sentence, I can by no means admit, that “because the Gospel is of divine authority, and ought to be received, that every rejection of its doctrines is as just a cause for condemnation and human penalties, as murder or theft.”

Of course every one will understand the lines marked with inverted commas to be the precise words used by Mr. M.—Now, they not only are not his words, but they convey a meaning perfectly inconsistent with the sentence which they pretend to represent.—That sentence consists of two clauses.—Of which the former, in Mr. M.’s second volume* stands thus; “that the Gospel is of divine authority, and ought to be received, on pain of condemnation, by every one, who has the opportunity of hearing it fairly proposed,”—The Author is evidently speaking of condemnation, NOW ALREADY BEFORE GOD, with a certain prospect of ultimate condemnation if the unbelief be persisted in;—and not of condemnation before any human tribunal.—The passage itself in question, the paragraph in which it is found, the

* Page 225.

the text* of Scripture quoted in support and in explanation of the doctrine insisted on, as well as the whole Essay which contains them;—all these things fix this meaning with the most demonstrative precision.—The latter clause of Mr. M.'s sentence is expressed in these words,—“and that a man ought no more to plead the pretences of conscience for rejecting its fundamentals, than for the commission of murder, theft, or any other criminal action.”

—Here it is very clearly affirmed, that no pretences of conscience are to be admitted in excuse of the great guilt incurred by rejecting the fundamentals of Christianity; but, there is not a single word said, respecting the punishment of that guilt by any human penalties.—The cases of murder and theft are introduced, because no man denies the commission of them to be great crimes; whereas men are slow and backward in acknowledging the GREATNESS of the sin of infidelity.

The Author rests his proof on the positive declarations of Scripture: and he thinks that if, as a previous step, men could be convinced and would bear in memory, that any pretences of conscience are as little to be pleaded in favour of infidelity as of murder or theft, some of the most specious objections to ecclesiastical establishments would be overturned †.

Mr. M.'s argument is stated, explained, and summed† up by himself in the clearest and most conclusive manner.

“The Gospel is of divine authority and ought to be received on pain of condemnation, by”——

In support of this position, he quotes the Scripture already mention from St. John:—And then he

* He that believeth not the Son shall not see life but the wrath of God abideth on him. John iii. 36.

† Page 327.

† Mr. M. p. 226. Vol. ii.

he infers, that, because the rejection of the Gospel implies so much wickedness of heart that the wrath of God is declared to abide on him who believeth not the Son, it is the duty of the supreme power to consult the good of the community by establishing the revealed religion*.—

The establishment and support of the true religion by the state is the important object, which the Author has in view.—In regard to the restraint and punishment of the propagators of irreligious opinions†,—he owns, that there are difficulties on that subject; and he certainly did not go so far as Dr. H. does, who asks why atheism should not be tolerated‡?

How widely different from this is Dr. H.'s representation of the matter!—According to him, Mr. M.'s words are, "every rejection of its doctrines is as just a cause for condemnation and human penalties, as murder and theft."

Mr. M. does not use the expression EVERY REJECTION at all; nor can a sentence be produced from any of his writings, to prove what Dr. H. insinuates him to mean by this gross misrepresentation.—Further, when Mr. M. says, "the Gospel is of divine authority and ought to be received, on pain of condemnation, by"—, the expression is perfectly intelligible to every reader,—but Dr. H. omits entirely, in the first clause of the sentence which he has quoted, the words "on pain of condemnation;" and introduces into the latter clause the words "as just a cause of condemnation:"—and not content with such an inexcusable transposition and mutilation, he also absolutely INSERTS the words, "human penalties" without the least foundation or warrant;—but, not without effect; for these words do certainly superadd to Mr. M.'s sentiments

* Mr. M. Vol. ii. p. 227.

† See p. 232.

‡ See Dr. H. Vol. i. p. 367.

sentiments the meaning, which Dr. H. ascribes to the whole passage.—Mr. M. does not use those words in the passage alluded to, nor any where near it; yet they are not only placed among the inverted commas as if they originated with him, but afterwards Dr. H. refers to Mr. M.*, and puts the words pains and penalties in italics, with the words EXPEDIENCY, UTILITY, and RIGHT also in italics; but let the astonished reader know that though these last words are in the page referred to, the two former are not.

§ 7. Again,—Dr. H. in Vol. i.† of his history of the Church, has the following sentence, “If the Supreme Power has no right, page 232, to violate liberty of conscience;” then it can have no right to “establish *true religion*, by positive institutions,” unless, &c.—In this place Dr. H. is referring to Mr. M.’s 2d Vol. p. 232, and the reader is to suppose that the words marked with inverted commas are taken fairly from that volume, according to the reference.—Whereas, whoever turns to the above-mentioned page 232, of Mr. M.’s second Volume, will find his words to be, “The Supreme power has no right to violate liberty of conscience by extorting confessions of faith.”—which is a proposition very different, both in meaning and in extent, from what Dr. H. represents it to be, by shamefully suppressing the latter clause of the sentence.

§ 8. Another instance of the same nature with the last, may be selected from p. 360 of the same volume. He accuses Mr. M. of saying†, that “in matters of subordinate consequence, which are evidently

* Page 226. Vol. ii.

† Page 359.

‡ Mr. M. p. 233. Vol. ii.

dently not essential to Christianity, the civil magistrate ought not to interfere at all."

The real words of Mr. M. are, "it would soon be agreed, that in matters of subordinate consequence, which are evidently not essential to Christianity, the civil magistrate ought not to interfere at all, by restraining or punishing such persons as differ from the establishment, but that he should suffer them to enjoy a complete toleration, and to serve God in their own way."—"Not to interfere at all,"—with a period after the word ALL;—and not to interfere at all, by restraining &c. are expressions nearly as different in their meaning, as the following; Dr. H. has hardly quoted a single sentence from Mr. M.—. and Dr. H. has hardly quoted a single sentence from Mr. M., FAITHFULLY.

§ 9. In page 357, Dr. H. addresses Mr. M. in these words, You ask, "May a magistrate compel "by pains and penalties to receive a national religion, and restrain others from the exercise of his "own judgment *? Would not this encourage persecution and be a tyranny over the consciences of "men?"—And why, continues Dr. H. evade answering, clearly and distinctly, your own questions?

By this quotation, connected with Dr. H.'s accusation of evasion, the Reader is led to conclude that Mr. M. maintained a doctrine of compulsion in religious concerns, than which nothing can be more repugnant to his real sentiments.

In several places he expresses himself on this head with the utmost precision.—Among others, in his second volume†, immediately after the passage mutilated by Dr. H., he has these remarkable

* The expression "restrain others from the exercise of his own judgment," sounds oddly;—nor are these the words of Mr. M., notwithstanding the inverted commas.—The writer of these animadversions, however, would in no case be understood to cavil at any slight and obvious mistake, either in quotation or in grammar, which did not affect the sense materially. † P. 231.

able words: "I endeavour to separate what is certain and important in this matter from what is doubtful and of less moment. I say without the least hesitation, Let no man be compelled to be a Christian*; in strict truth, he cannot. Every man not only ought to have, but must have the right of private judgment."—And a little after he adds, "It is contrary to duty that men should be forced to profess what they do not believe, because hypocrisy will be the certain, and an augmented enmity, the probable consequence."—In regard to the passage itself, it is altered in several respects from Mr. M.'s expressions; and, moreover, there is again an actual interpolation of the words PAINS and PENALTIES.—Thus by leaving out some words,—by inserting others,—by totally suppressing a most important part of the author's answer to the questions,—and by accusing him of evasion, Dr. H. insinuates, to the Reader's mind, sentiments the very opposite to those, which Mr. M.'s two pages are calculated to impress: He insinuates, that Mr. M. really thought,—though he might judge it inexpedient to speak out,—that in religious concerns the magistrate had a right to restrain the subject from the exercise of his own judgment by pains and penalties, and to compel him to receive the national religion in such a way as to hurt his conscience.—It is true Mr. M. does not pretend to satisfy completely every enquiry that may be imagined in this difficult subject: He explains clearly how far he can go;—and if he do not go the full length, which Dr. H. thinks he ought to do, that will be a very insufficient reason for telling the public, that he has really said things, which he never did say.

But

* See the note at the bottom of page 33, where this passage is again referred to; and this 16th page is, by mistake, called the 32d page of these animadversions.—In fact, it is the xxxii. page of the Preface to 2d, Edit. of Vol. I. Eccles. History.

But, doubtless, in future, Dr. H.'s evidences,—his inverted commas—will be cross examined very closely by all persons who, shall read this Preface.

§ 10. The last instances of this odious sort of perversion,—the last, which the Editor means to notice, but by no means the last of the many, which deserve severe animadversion,—are to be found in page 370 of Dr. H.'s first volume:—Where he says,—Mr. M. supposes*, —“That without a state-establishment there would be no religion among us.”—Let not the Reader forget the inverted commas; and then let him peruse the place referred to by Dr. H.—Mr. M.'s words are, “Without an establishment provided by the state, the greater part will scarce have any religion at all; wickedness will be practised on the boldest scale; and, if the form of government have a large portion of liberty in its texture, the manners will be egregiously dissolute.”

§ 11. In the same 370th page, Dr. H. says, “If bigotry can dwell in such minds as Mr. Milner's, what may we not expect from other men? Why should *God set his face against every government, which does not fence religion with penal sanctions.*”—The letters here printed in Italics are also in Italics in Dr. H.'s book; but the reader, who turns to the bottom of Mr. M.'s 240th page, will perceive that Dr. H.'s Italics are as little disposed to observe the rules of veracity as his inverted commas.—Mr. M.'s expression is, “Even if the government were, in other respects, the soundest and the wisest effort of human sagacity, it will probably prove only a curse to its citizens, unless some legal provision be

* Page 240.

be made for religion.—God himself, there is the highest reason to conclude, **WILL SET HIS FACE AGAINST IT**, and confound it.”

Let this sentence be compared with Dr. H.’s representation of it.

§ 12. Since the above was written, a judicious friend of the Editor, who had read Dr. H.’s first dissertation, suggested, that the 378th page of his first volume ought by no means to pass unnoticed.—Perhaps, in no page ever yet printed was there so much misrepresentation crowded together.

Dr. H. says, I trust I have now proved, — —
 “ that the propositions you set out with, (meaning
 “ Mr. M.) are utterly unfounded, and the very
 “ reverse of them, truth.” — He then proceeds to make his readers understand what were Mr. M.’s propositions, which, he says, are the reverse of the truth.—“ That Theodosius had *no* right to
 “ make his religion, that of the state universally,
 “ with pains and penalties. on the dissenters from
 “ his impositions.—That every man in this matter
 “ is to be left to his own conscience, undisturbed,
 “ as long as he is a peaceable subject. —That it is
 “ an unwarranted violation of the right of private
 “ judgment to impose religious sentiments on the
 “ subjects of any government with pains and penalties for non-conformity; and that, therefore, Theodosius, and all others who have acted
 “ like him, are chargeable with a criminal abuse
 “ of authority.”

The word *no* is in Italics: all the rest of the propositions are marked with inverted commas; and, it is impossible that the reader should make any other inference than that they are Mr. M.’s very words, with the single exception of the word *no*.

It

It is really painful to remark, that this whole representation is contrary to truth, both as it respects the words and their meaning.

§ 13. The Editor of this Volume of Mr. M.'s history, wishes it most explicitly to be understood that, in printing these animadversions, his object is not, in the smallest degree, either to confute the dangerous and impracticable notions of Dr. H., or to defend what he conceives to be the constitutional and Scriptural system of Mr. M.—The latter task has already been executed frequently by the ablest writers:—In regard to the former, he feels as little inclined to attempt it as he would be to undertake a confutation of the Jacobinical principles of the present day;—to which indeed the fundamental maxims of Dr. H., in ecclesiastical matters, seem but too nearly allied.

When a Clergyman of the Church of England can so far forget the dictates of plain sense, and the duties of his sacred profession, as to ask the question, why atheism should not be tolerated*, the Editor makes no scruple to own, that so MARKED a circumstance, even if it stood single, would to him be a sufficient admonition not to lose time in fruitless controversy with that Clergyman concerning ecclesiastical polity, or ecclesiastical toleration. He may hope, by these few pages of animadversion to stop the practice of positive misquotation; but not, by a volume, to correct inveterate habits of misrepresentation, or determined prejudices against all kind of restraint in the dissemination of opinions. Mr. M. with great judgment and knowledge of human nature, observes, “I do not think it sufficient to say, the truth will take care of itself: The unlearned and the

* Dr. H. Vol. i. p. 367.

the unwary ought not to be exposed to the mischievous effects of such publications*.”—No man had a greater regard for sober and rational liberty: but he reflected with sorrow; that the children of this world are often in their generation not only wiser than the children of light†, but also more active and industrious:—He saw that the wicked and designing laid successful snares for young, inexperienced and artless minds, and that the enemy was assiduous in sowing tares,—from the pulpit,—from the press,—and in conversation; whilst those, who were commissioned to watch, were frequently either asleep, or neglectful, or even maintaining that the adversary had a natural right to do all the mischief he could.—But, however desperate may appear the cure of certain diseased individuals, it will not thence follow that we ought not to warn the public of the contagious nature of the malady. For, the romantic and visionary theories of modern discontented demagogues, respecting the authority of the multitude or of majorities,—particularly, when the seditious and inflammatory dress, in which they are often presented to the public eye, is taken into the account,—ought, really, both in civil and in religious concerns, to be considered as the irrational, infectious, productions of distempered intellect. A CONFUTATION of them is by far too respectable a term: They are to be exposed: Their mischievous tendency is to be exhibited: The public caution is to be excited. A contagion is spreading; and salutary preventives are called for.—On such occasions recourse should be had to the very best expedients for preserving the intellectual health of the community; and in this view, perhaps, no expedient will be found more effectual than to direct the labours.

* Milner's History, Vol. ii. p. 234.

† Luke xvi. 8.

labours of the closet to the detection of the detestable arts of positive and unequivocal misrepresentation;—which, in seasons of this kind, abound much more than is usually imagined.—This expedient, as it is most honourable in its principle, and powerful in its operative consequences, will have large claims on the gratitude of the public, who, doubtless, in future will mark the presumptuous zealots, who have imposed on their credulity: and, surely, it may also be added, that this same expedient will be most likely to reclaim young profelytes in Jacobinism, whether in civil or in religious politics, when they have been instructed to perceive that their judgments were warped, or their passions heated by absolute impositions.

§ 14. It is not without design, that the Editor, in the preceding paragraph, uses the words positive and unequivocal misrepresentation;—for first, they are the mildest and the least offensive terms, that occur to him, to denote the criminality of a writer, who dares to misquote his adversary, both in the words, and in the meaning of particular sentences:—And, secondly, they distinguish the single, well-defined offence of quoting expressly words, which were never so used, either literally or substantially, from all others, which may be included under the vague and general term of misrepresentation.—It is misrepresentation in this precise way and degree, that forms the complaint of the Editor.

§ 15. The distinction between the two species of misrepresentation is important, and ought to be well impressed on the memory.

In vague and general misrepresentations of persons or things a reader of any caution or experience,

before he surrenders his assent, reflects whether the reasons adduced by his author, justify the strong conclusions he has drawn; and if they be found deficient for the purpose, he, at least, suspends his judgment, — and, perhaps, harbours suspicions of heat, of party or of prejudice, which lead to a nicer investigation of the truth: — But when the misrepresentation is specific, and positive; as, for example, when it is affirmed that an adversary has used certain individual words, or, that he has advanced a particular determinate proposition; and these assertions prove not to be true, there are few readers indeed who may not be imposed on by such controversial intrepidity as this; there are few indeed, who will suspect, that such positive declarations do really conceal and imply a want of veracity.

In this way much error and delusion may be propagated without suspicion; and much mischief done before detection can take place: Few people will take the trouble to look at originals, so long as it is thought impossible that they should be mistated. — Thus, many proselytes may owe their conversion to proceedings of this sort; and men may become vehement advocates, or intemperate opponents all their lives after; and they may die without ever knowing that the magic sentences, which first biased their judgments, or inflamed their passions, were, in the strictest sense, positive and unequivocal misrepresentations.

§ 16. The force of the Editor's accusation consists in this, that whenever sentences or paragraphs are produced from any writer in the way in which Dr. H. has produced them from Mr. M., the Reader expects that the lines marked with inverted commas should be precisely the words, which are used in the place referred to.

— It

—It is a very insufficient defence of misquotation to urge, that the MEANING of the passages will, on examination, be found substantially the same; and it is no defence at all to endeavour to shew that such MUST be an author's meaning from his context, or from other parts of his writings.—This last is a very good rule in the interpretation of ambiguous or misconstrued passages; when, to find out and fix some meaning is the declared object of the writer; but it is totally inadmissible in direct and positive citations.—In these, the very words should be strictly adhered to; as it is no uncommon thing for sentences or paragraphs, which on the first reading were thought intelligible and plain, to become doubtful and obscure, by being construed differently by different persons, and even by the same persons at different times.—By these and similar reasons, the Editor is convinced that his friends reasoned wisely in advising him to place upon its true footing the credit and reputation of Dr. H. as a controversial writer.—On no foundation whatever, solid or sandy, can he build an excuse for his misquotations.—They are not the words of the author: They are not the meaning of the sentences in point: Nor, lastly, are they the author's general sentiments;—though if they were,—that circumstance would be no apology for erroneous citations.

This charge is the heavier, because the subject is important,—the publication recent—and Dr. H. made the attack.

§ 17. In the opinion of the Editor Dr. H.'s book abounds with GROSS misrepresentations of the GENERAL and indeterminate species, as well as with those which have been called positive and unequivocal, because limited to the particular words

and meanings as quoted from authors; but he by no means indulges the vain hope that any thing he could urge would produce in that writer's mind a conviction either of intemperate expression or of erroneous judgment.—There are no scales or measures to adjust and settle such questions as these: and as nothing but scales or measures can be effective, where there is not something of a dispassionate spirit, which investigates prudently, concedes candidly, and determines impartially, the disputed positions would, doubtless, remain exactly where they were, as far as Dr. H. and Mr. M. and the Editor are concerned.

Dr. H. would still trust that he had left them “no longer involved in difficulties* :” and the Editor would expect to hear the same clamour and outcry concerning persecution and the right of private judgment: In all such cases, therefore, it must be left to a judicious public to decide from the respective characters of the authors, and from a collective view of their performances,—who has most deserved their praise,—who has most laboured in the cause of truth and piety,—who has most displayed the mild tempers and graces of the Christian;—and lastly, who has taken by the hand the diligent enquiring student, and conducted him through thorny and pathless regions with honesty, ability, and discretion; and who has bewildered and confounded the same, by despising faithful guides, encouraging rash projects, and furnishing treacherous information.

The Editor is well aware that misrepresentations, in the loose, indeterminate and extended use of that term, are both hard to avoid and hard to prove: Charges also of this nature are easily made, and easily defended: on all sides there

* See Dr. H.'s Vol. i. p. 378.

there is plenty of room for dexterity and evasion; so that often there will be no end of controversy. Habits, tempers, education, prejudices, keep even the most able and most ingenuous minds at a distance and in opposition: In spite of argument or remonstrance, men continue to exaggerate, to misconceive, and to mistake.

§ 18. As the writer of these animadversions has positively asserted that Dr. H.'s volumes, besides the misquotations, abound also,—not only with venial or unavoidable errors,—but with gross misrepresentations of the indeterminate kind; that is, where the sense of an author is perverted, though there be no specific mistatement of his words, he will, in confirmation of that general censure, as well as in further explanation of the distinction between the different sorts of misrepresentation, solicit the reader's attention for a single moment to a remarkable instance in point.—Dr. H. in the beginning of his first dissertation, speaks of the emperor Theodosius in the following terms:—He “resolved to reduce his Christian subjects to uniformity with his own opinions, which he presumed to be those of the Scriptures. Instead of union in the one head Christ, held in mutual charity and forbearance, he determined to cut and square religion according to his own model, and by penal laws, to compel submission to the establishment which he formed. Mr. Milner undertakes to defend the propriety of this conduct.”—Now let us hear Mr. M. from the bottom of page 197, Vol. ii. to the middle of page 198.—“Theodosius, earnestly desirous to reduce all, who professed the Christian name to an uniformity, once more attempted to unite them by a conference at Constantinople: But where the heart was not the

the same, it appeared that outward conformity produced only hypocrisy. The Novatians alone agreed cordially with the general Church in sentiment."—

———— "In consequence of this, these dissenters obtained from the emperor as ample a toleration as could reasonably be desired. Heavy and tyrannical penalties were denounced in edicts against the rest, which, however, do not appear to have been executed. The denunciation of them itself was, therefore, wrong, though it must be owned it proceeded from the best intentions on the side of Theodosius, who actually put none of his penal laws against sectaries into execution, and meant only to induce all men to speak alike in the Church. How much better, to have taken pains in promoting the propagation of the Gospel itself by the encouragement of zealous pastors, and to have given up the zeal for a chimera of no value—a pretended union without the reality"—!

Mr. M. in this passage, clearly expresses an opinion, that the penal laws of Theodosius against sectaries, proceeded from the best intentions on the part of the emperor; and that he meant only to induce all men to speak alike; and he adds, as a fact, that he actually put none of those laws into execution.—In this same passage also, with equal clearness, Mr. M. pronounces these very penalties, or penal edicts, **HEAVY** and **TYRANNICAL**; and adds, that the denunciation of them itself was therefore wrong; and that it would have been much better to have taken pains in promoting the Gospel, and to have given up the zeal for a chimera of no value.—Did Dr. H. mistake Mr. M.'s candid interpretation of the **MOTIVES** of the emperor for a **DEFENCE** of his conduct? Or, rather,—Is it not utterly unaccountable that he should represent Mr. M.

as

as a defender of that very conduct, which he has marked in the most pointed terms of disapprobation?—And the more so as Dr. H.*¹⁶¹, by quoting the very page, proves that he had read the passages.

§ 19. After what has been said, it is scarcely necessary to assure the Reader, that by bringing together into view these two paragraphs from their respective authors, the Editor does not, in the slightest degree, mean to call in question the complete right of Dr. H. to deliver his own sentiments freely.—If HE think that Theodosius did wrong, and that Mr. M. approved his conduct, by all means let him say so. The writer of this preface will never complain on such an account.—Indeed he claims to himself a similar privilege, and he freely exercises it in this preface by warning the public of the danger of receiving implicitly the determinations of Dr. H. in ecclesiastical history; and, therefore, it would be inconsistent in him to encroach at all upon Dr. H.'s equal right to censure, applaud, and represent the sentiments of others, according to the suggestions of his own judgment or fancy. Let Dr. H., then, express as much astonishment, and as often as he pleases, at the opinions of Mr. M.: Let him take advantage of the democratical and profane turn of the present day; and describe that historian as bigoted and superstitious, and as a supporter of passive obedience and of high church principles; still,—all this with the Editor would be no proper ground of complaint: he would place it all to the score of partiality and prejudice and discontent; and would never judge these cautionary animadversions either necessary or expedient.—His complaint

* See Dr. H. Vol. i. p. 352. Dr. H. quotes Mr. M's. 198th page, vol. II. and as usual, misrepresents him exceedingly.

complaint commences precisely when Dr. H. begins to misquote: when Dr. H. informs the public that his literary adversary has written sentences which he did not write: when Dr. H. imposes on the credulity of his readers, by so altering or mutilating particular passages of Mr. M.'s history as to produce meanings different from the real ones, and sometimes opposite to them.—A partial and a prejudiced judge may be endured,—but, if that judge should become also a witness, the smallest deviation from the sacred duty excites alarm and indignation.

§ 20. This last instance from Dr. H.'s history, respecting Theodosius' treatment of his Christian subjects, is extremely well adapted to illustrate the Editor's important distinction between the two sorts of misrepresentation: and it is not improbable but that the friends of Dr. H. may conceive the Editor himself, in the following statement, to be guilty of the same fault.—Let the public decide.

For, the Writer of these animadversions, by the incontrovertible facts, which he has produced, certainly feels himself justified in now submitting to the careful and studious reader a summary view of the principles and practice of Dr. H. in the conduct of his Impartial history.—That work appears to him to be written in the spirit of party and of temporal views.—He thinks, that the author, in his judgment of the characters of princes or dignitaries, is, in general, very little influenced by the soundness of their faith, or by their exemplary manners; but rather by their agreement or disagreement with his own notions of ecclesiastical polity: That an excessive regard for a wild species of ecclesiastical liberty; a reverence for the authority of congregations and majorities; and a hatred of dignities, and of positive institutions greatly

greatly disturb his understanding by perpetually suggesting ideas of many penal laws, restraints, punishments, fences, fetters, and human penalties, which exist in his own imagination; but not in the communities which he attacks: Then, in particular, he thinks, that he has painted the orthodox belief and honest ardour of the emperor Theodosius in the most unfeeling, indiscriminate, and unwarrantable language: That he has written nauseous and disgusting encomiums on the lenity of Julian the apostate: That he has reviled with illiberal contempt, and with blind, presumptuous invective the pious memories of some of the most excellent primitive fathers: That, besides many palpable misquotations from the late Mr. M., he has often misrepresented his GENERAL sense and meaning in the grossest manner;—and lastly,—That he appears constantly to confound a zeal for a free and open ecclesiastical establishment with a zeal for a compulsory and insincere uniformity—A very singular and a very productive error!

§ 21. Such are the most deliberate sentiments of the Editor.—But, at the same time that he both maintains the above statement to be faithful in itself, and foresees that it will be pronounced so, upon trial, by every impartial reader, he not only admits that it ought not, but he expects that it will not, be received by a cautious public without reserve and further enquiry.—The certainty of such reserve being used, and of such enquiry being made, entirely falls in with his ideas of all general representations and criticisms of this kind, however decisive and peremptory the terms may be in which they are expressed: There is, therefore, no danger of the public being misled by them: They will examine, whether the Editor has not himself been

been guilty of misrepresentation in what he calls a faithful statement: nor will any careful reader condemn Dr. H. before he has perused the necessary pages:—Not so,—when Dr. H. positively and unequivocally quotes a passage from Mr. M. which is not in his book. Thousands of readers may THEN draw practical inferences from such imaginary passages without the slightest suspicion of fallacy: the greatness of this literary crime becomes the security for its commission; and even Dr. H. himself, if he should, in future, sincerely repent of the practice, may not have it in his power to reclaim his deluded readers.—Let this species of misrepresentation, therefore, be always exposed and chastised:—It is done with little trouble: There can be no dispute about it; and yet the effects may be extensive, salutary and permanent:—For, though it be true, that readers are, in general, much disposed to give credit to the specific and positive quotations of authors, without further examination, it does not hence follow, that when a practice of this nature is once detected, the literary punishment should not be exceedingly heavy: Reputation once lost in this way is hard to be regained;—all a man's assertions in future are received with a jealous scrupulosity:—and, perhaps, he may frequently be disbelieved even when he speaks the truth.

When Dr. H.'s late performance was first put into the hands of the Editor of the second edition of Mr. M.'s first volume, he had not the smallest suspicion that it could possibly contain any such examples of the fallaciousness of human testimony as those which have been mentioned; but he cannot now read a page of that author without experiencing a painful apprehension of being misled by him in one shape or another. It is true this consequent distrust is both the natural punishment
of

of a false guide, and the best protection against his future impositions; and, therefore, the wisdom and expediency of such a provision in the constitution of man is exceedingly striking;—the necessity of it, however, affords a mortifying reflection to the mind;—and the more so, where men of education,—where Christians,—where the clergy are concerned.

§ 22. By their fruits ye shall know them*.—Daily experience convinces us that, where an uncommon and an ostentatious profession is made of great love for simplicity, liberty, the right of private judgment, &c. very little credit is often to be given to these extraordinary and magnificent pretensions: they are rather, in many cases, the signal for peculiar caution, and watchfulness.—An inexperienced controversialist, after reading these animadversions, would hardly suppose that Dr. H. is the man, who should affect to be panting after greater purity of principle and more apostolic manners than are to be found in any existing visible Church of Christians;—or, again, that Dr. H. of all others, should be the man to brand the pious memories of such excellent characters, as Ambrose, Jerom, and Chrysostom, by affirming that “they severally stand convicted of a WANT OF TRUTH, that the meanest Christian at present would blush to have laid to his charge, and confounded to have proved upon him †.”

The friends and familiars of Dr. H. will, doubtless, blush for the many instances of disingenuous depravity, which disgrace his late publication; and truly pious Christians of all denominations will lament that profession and practice should be so much at variance.

When

* Matthew, Chap. 7. verse 20.

† Dr. H. Vol. i. page 336.

§ 23. When the candid reader reflects how much the late Mr. M.'s sentiments on ecclesiastical establishments have been misrepresented by the publication in question, the Editor trusts, he will not think it improper in him to subjoin, in this place, a compendious statement of the real principles which that industrious and careful historian maintained; and by which he was directed in his ecclesiastical researches and representations.—This may be done with great brevity, and with very little repetition of what has already been said.

Mr. M. was extremely attached to order and regularity; but he had no improper fondness whatever for hierarchy. No man was further removed from bigotry in the most comprehensive meaning of the term;—from the bigotry of popular and democratical faction as well as from that of superstitious and blind submission to authority: He detested persecution in every shape: No proposition could be more opposite to his wishes, or more distant from his thoughts, than that which Dr. H. ascribes to him without the smallest foundation; namely, that every rejection of the doctrine of Christianity is as just a cause for condemnation and human penalties as murder and theft. He was a fair, and a zealous defender of ecclesiastical establishments according to Scriptural ideas, and the principles of the British constitution as illustrated and developed in the Toleration act: He never contends for uniformity in the sense in which Dr. H. represents him to have done*.—If, by uniformity be understood the existence of one, and only of one religious establishment in an empire, or in the same part of an empire, as in England or Scotland, then it is true, and,—in no other sense is it true—that

Mr.

Mr. M. contends for an uniformity. No doubt, he would have rejoiced in a sincere uniformity under the protection of one establishment, if the present state of human imperfection could have admitted it; but he was too well acquainted with the corrupt principles and ungovernable passions of man to expect so much moderation, candour and harmony:—and he always expresses his detestation of **COMPULSION** in this matter. “Let no man,” says he, in the passage already referred to, “be compelled to be a Christian,”—which is going much farther than saying, Let no man be compelled to become a member of the establishment.—It was no satisfaction to him to find that, in any case, an increase of conformity was purchased at the expence of integrity: nor would he allow that, in that way, the Church of England could possibly derive any advantage but what was indirect and precarious.—He would not deny, that, perhaps, by such unnatural intrusions, the less cautious and less diligent members of her communion might be put more on their guard.

This description contains the practical and the theoretical principles of Mr. M. on these contentious subjects.—The substance of them may be briefly expressed in distinct propositions;—thus, —The Supreme power has a right and ought to establish the true religion by positive institutions; but, it has no right to extort confessions of faith.—It has also a right to restrain men from deriding and profaning the sacred institutions of the country, and from propagating infidelity, idolatry, atheism and gross irreligion of every sort.—The essentials of revealed religion cannot be neglected or despised without a turpitude of heart, which the Scripture

• Page 32 of these animadversions.

C

Scripture connects with the final ruin of the soul*. — These essentials or fundamental articles are few; but they are of immense importance and should be carefully selected by the legislator from subordinate truths and circumstantialia: and, lastly, in all matters of subordinate consequence, which are not evidently essential to Christianity, the civil magistrate should suffer men to enjoy a complete toleration, and to serve God in their own way.

These are nearly the very words of Mr. M.; and the moderate and truly Christian sentiments, which they express, appear in his history† throughout: The Editor espouses them with as much pointed decision as he recoils from Dr. H's. unfounded censures and extravagant opinions: mid of noisat

§ 24. IN THE MANAGEMENT of these Animadversions, the writer hopes, that, consistently with so much brevity, he has taken the most effectual way of guarding the public in general, and the Church of England in particular, from the daring impositions of a man, who would still be considered as a friend and a brother‡.

He has shewn them how to make a proper estimate of the credit of this same friend and brother by convicting him of positive and direct mistatements of the words and sentiments of Mr. M., — the Author, whom he was opposing; and he has subjoined a brief review of that Author's real opinions. — He has, also, warned them explicitly of the gross partialities and averfions of Dr. H.; and of his numerous misrepresentations of the vague and indeterminate kind; and he has expressly laid before

* Mr. M. Vol. ii. p. 241.

† See, particularly, Mr. M. Vol. ii. Chap. xvii.

‡ Dr. H. says in his introduction, p. ix, — "Having &c. — been called to minister in the Church of England, I have embraced and subscribed her articles *ex animo*, and have continued to prefer an episcopal mode of Government; and I am content herein to abide with God, till I can find one more purely apostolic."

fore them one palpable instance of this last sort, in the case of Theodosius. — He could easily have furnished many more examples of a similar nature; but this would have been besides his purpose; and, as he neither expects, nor desires to be believed on his own bare assertion, he confidently refers the cautious reader to Dr. H.'s book itself, and requests him to compare its contents with Mr. M.'s volumes, and with the authentic documents of ancient history.

§ 25. It is not to be denied, that expressions of commendation of some parts of the English ecclesiastical institutions have dropped from the pen of Dr. H.; — but notwithstanding this, it appears very clear, that, whoever can digest his representation of persons and things in general, must soon become a weak friend, or a bitter enemy of the Church of England: — and for this reason, — because the tendency of his performance, in the main and with very slight exceptions, is to lessen respect for that Church, to increase dislikes, prejudices and objections; and to render its rulers odious and contemptible with the most indiscriminating indecency.

The Editor of the second edition of this first Volume freely owns, that this last consideration became an additional motive in determining his mind to animadvert upon Dr. H.'s late publication. It is allowed, that, of late years, there has appeared a very manifest and desperate design to undermine and subvert all respect for regular and constituted authorities both in Church and State: and this, under the plausible pretence of regard for natural liberty and the right of private judgment. At such a season, he could not be induced to think that a work, so replete both with dangerous sentiment and unfair management, ought to pass unnoticed.

Dr. H. may continue to profess respect and reverence for the Church of which he is a member; and far be it from the Editor, even in his own mind, to pass any sentence unfavourable to his sincerity: The Editor only pretends to judge of actions and their tendencies by the rules of common sense and experience; and, on these grounds, he has a full persuasion, that whatever professions Dr. H. may make, if he continue to act as he has done of late, the enemies of the Church of England will not fail to enumerate him as one of their own party;—as one,—who only waits for favourable moments to demolish and trample upon the venerable institutions by which he has long been cherished and supported, and of which he has solemnly and repeatedly declared his express approbation.

§ 26. It has indeed been hinted to the Editor, that he is giving too much importance to a performance so superficial and so uncandid as that of Dr. H. —But be this as it may;—Be his reasons, when they are put together and well considered, satisfactory or not, he is very sincere in declaring, that though, ultimately and on the whole, he felt a considerable preponderancy of argument in favour of the step, which he has taken in writing these animadversions, he did not arrive at that conclusion without considerable hesitation.—Weighty objections occurred to his mind; but they were overbalanced.—It will not be necessary to describe his feelings on the occasion;—the most material will readily occur to considerate persons.

The greatest admirers of Dr. H. cannot be more solicitous than he has been to discover some explanation of that Author's conduct, that might be intelligible and probable without having recourse to the supposition of more DEFECT OF

PRINCIPLE

PRINCIPLE than is implied in mere inadvertency, haste, prejudice, strong attachment to party, and such like.—If the Writer could, conscientiously, have owned that he felt himself tolerably satisfied on this point, it might have turned the balance the other way, at least for the present, and he might have spared himself this unpleasant task.—He well knows that the common enemies of Christianity rejoice, when those, who should be its supporters, have disputes and contentions among themselves; or, in any shape, act a part inconsistent with their profession; and he would not unnecessarily, afford them occasions for triumph.—He felt also, that there might be some danger of indulging feelings inconsistent with Christian patience and forbearance; and, there is no petition which he offers up with more sincerity and fervency, than “Lead us not into temptation.”

§ 27. As soon as it became his deliberate judgment, that these and all other objections ought to be encountered, he resolved to use plainness of speech suited to the occasion, and simply to describe his own sentiments without affectation or hypocrisy.—On such occasions, it is very much the practice of the world to assume a great appearance of patient coolness and apathy, which ill corresponds both with what is felt in the closet, and with the effect intended to be produced; but the writer of these animadversions is no admirer of this practice, nor does he see any example of it in Scripture, nor does any particular circumstance suggest to him the duty or the propriety of disguising or suppressing honest indignation.—The offence is of a public nature: No symptoms of penitence have appeared: The mischief is operating.

He

He hopes, notwithstanding, that he has felt no emotions, which have led him to break the Scripture rule, "Be ye angry and sin not,"—and he is sure that he has most conscientiously confined himself to the points in question, and not suffered himself to be entangled, drawn aside, or exasperated by the consideration of any extraneous matter whatever.

From Dr. H. himself he has not received the slightest personal offence: and he is, also, ready to acknowledge, that that author speaks much more respectfully of Mr. M., and allows him much greater excellence of character and ability in every point of view than literary adversaries usually do, who differ so much on any subject in which they are much interested.

§ 28. A Writer, who, in this plain and decisive way, accuses, but not without proof, and censures, but not without justice and moderation, has a right to be believed when he FURTHER declares that, though the supposition of inadvertency, of heat of temper, of prejudice and party, of the hope and prospect of security on account of Mr. M.'s decease,—in a word, though every supposition—short of design,—and though all the suppositions, taken together as an aggregate, which he can make, appear to him completely inadequate to the explanation of the conduct of Dr. H.,—still, he cannot bring himself steadily to abide by the opinion of a wilful intention in that author to deceive, in the degree, which the facts imply.—If this declaration should be thought, in any measure, inconsistent with other things stated in these animadversions, the writer has no objection that the suspicion of contradiction should be explained by the puzzle which has hampered his own mind, whenever he has suffered himself to reflect on the motives

motives of the conduct in question; and by the sort of fluctuation of judgment which is usually experienced in such disagreeable and difficult circumstances. — The disagreeableness and the difficulty of the circumstances consist in this; — The facts are decisive; and, as far as they are concerned, they incurably and irrecoverably convict Dr. H. of positive and direct misrepresentations, and would justify much stronger language than any which has been used in this statement to the public. — Now, though the inference from the facts to the motives seems natural and even unavoidable, still, it is with great reluctance that the mind acquiesces in passing so heavy a censure. It looks around with anxiety for some way of escape that may be less dishonourable; and, though it does not succeed, it always has one resource left; — namely, — to leave the motives with the Searcher of all hearts. — It is, however, not to be dissembled, that even this resource, as far as it may be supposed to have any tendency to mitigate the accusations against Dr. H., is but slender and inadequate; and, that it is supported rather by the previous improbability of the existence of such dishonourable motives, than by any want of evidence, or by any imperfection in the reasoning which connects together actions and their principles.

§ 29. How deceitful is the human heart! And how watchful ought every one to be, who eagerly embarks in a cause, which is connected with religion, lest he should be found substituting human inventions in the place of the Gospel of Christ; or, lest he should mistake his own partialities and attachments for pure brotherly love and Christian affection! — How much is it to be wished, also, that all men were more accustomed to turn inward the
eyes

eyes of their understanding in the way of self-examination!—They would then, both have less time to scrutinize the defects of others, and also be more disposed to interpret those defects with candour and equity!—In the holy Scriptures men are exhorted to try the spirit and temper of professors of Christianity, whether they be really of God; and, on this important head, two things deserve most seriously to be noted: First,—That an excessive attachment to any species of ecclesiastical establishment is, in itself, by no means a decisive evidence of a truly Christian disposition; for no such test is to be found among the Scripture-rules for the trial of spirits. Secondly, That either an attachment or an aversion of this sort, excessively indulged and gratified, to the exclusion of an habitual practice of self-denial and of watchfulness against temptations of every kind, may deplorably evince the dominion of a carnal spirit, which may have taken possession of a man, may always be uppermost in the thoughts, may darken the understanding, and dispose it to endless misconceptions.

There is, no doubt, abundant reason to lament the errors and vices of professors of Christianity in every age; but, it is no very salutary practice to be frequently employed either in exaggerating the real failings of antient times, or in contemplating with complacency THE IMAGINARY excellencies of our own.—The historian in particular, is always called upon to dispense justice with impartiality and to convey instruction with discernment.

The prudent reader will observe that these reflections are by no means miscellaneous or irrelevant.—If the perusal of Dr. H's. history be conceived

ceived to have suggested them, it is because that performance appears uncommonly defective in the just appreciation of genuine piety and of spiritual graces: it is because it has a great tendency to puff up modern Separatists and discontented persons of all denominations with a vain conceit of their religious attainments,—to induce a proud belief of vast superiority on comparison with the early Christians,—to withdraw the mind from the cultivation of internal practical humility,—and to dispose it to estimate the fruits of godliness, rather by a contentious zeal for external ordinances and regulations than by a vigorous mortification of the flesh with its affections and lusts.

§ 30. The facts and observations contained in these animadversions will, probably, convince many Readers, that the Impartial history of Dr. H., so far from having superseded the necessity of the continuation of Mr. M.'s plan, renders that continuation still more desirable;—and the Writer assures the public, that nothing, which is contained in that publication, shall, as far as he is concerned, delay the progress of the fourth volume for a single moment.

§ 31. As Editor of this second edition of the first volume, his duty requires him most gratefully to acknowledge the liberal patronage of the University of Cambridge, in having, at their expence, already printed three volumes of Mr. M.'s Ecclesiastical history; and in having engaged to print the remaining manuscript papers relative to the same subject. — Their kindness and consideration in this matter certainly makes an indelible impression on his mind:—And, if any thing could increase his affectionate attachment to that learned body after

so long and active a residence among them, it would be this honourable token of respect to the memory of his deceased brother; who, himself, many years ago, as a Student in the same Seminary*, received distinguished marks of approbation.

§ 32. The liberties, which the Editor has taken with the MEANING OF THE MATTER of the Author in this new edition, are very few; for, the more he has examined and compared with each other the original authorities, which are frequently obscure and contradictory, the more scrupulously faithful he has found him in his statement of facts, and the more judicious and discreet in separating truth from error, and in assigning the just degrees of probabilities.—If the alterations from the old edition should, in some few instances, appear, on the comparison, to be greater than might from this account be expected, the Reader is to understand, that these are to be justified either from actual remarks of the Author in manuscript, or from the Editor's recollection of his conversations.—In regard to the observations and reflections contained in the work, the Editor conceives that the public will expect to have those of the Author himself, —as indeed, by his talents, his taste, and his experience in religious enquiries, he was eminently qualified to make them.

The smaller alterations, however,—in the use of particles, and of particular words, and in the construction of sentences, are very numerous;—and, if the Editor has helped the perspicuity of the Author

* Mr. Milner took his degree of B. A. in the year 1766; and obtained, as a prize, one of the Chancellor's gold medals. The Candidates were uncommonly numerous and able.

Two handsome gold Medals are given annually by the Chancellor of the University of Cambridge to such Bachelors of Arts as excel in classical learning.

Author, without diminishing his force, he has gained his aim.

At the time the first edition of this volume was printed, the Author had very few moments of time, which he could possibly bestow on correcting either his copy or the press.

On the whole, the Reader will not fail to find this first volume much improved by this new Edition. The type, the printing, and the paper are all much better; and several helps to the memory are here supplied, which were omitted in the former Edition.



Author, without diminishing his force, he has gained his aim.

At the time the first edition of this volume was printed, the Author had very few moments of time, which he could possibly bestow on correcting either his copy or the press.

On the whole, however, he will not fail to find this first volume much improved by this new Edition. The typography is better, and the paper is of much better quality. Several helps to the memory are here supplied, which were omitted in the former Edition.



